

5. *Handwritten*

55

~~SECRET~~30th December, 1959.COCOM Document 3715.72/2BCOORDINATING COMMITTEERECORD OF DISCUSSIONONITEM 1572 - MAGNETIC RECORDERS2nd and 8th December, 1959

Present: Belgium(Luxembourg), Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States.

References: COCOM Docs. Nos. 3700.2, 3715.00/1, 3715.72/1 and W.P. 1572/1.

1. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate referred to the statement he had made on the 17th November (see COCOM Doc. 3715.72/1) to the effect that his Delegation considered that the present definition of Item 1572 was unsatisfactory and that it would be useful to look for a more precise definition which would exclude recorders normally used in connection with computers not embargoed under Item 1565. The United Kingdom Delegation had studied this matter and proposed that the definition be amended as follows:

"Magnetic recorders and/or reproducers (other than those designed for voice or music, or for electronic computers not embargoed under Item 1565); and specialised recording media, parts and components therefor."

2. Commenting on the United Kingdom proposal, the UNITED STATES Delegate stated that he would be happy to hear the arguments which the United Kingdom Delegation intended to submit in support of their proposal. The United Kingdom amendment, he felt, raised a dual problem. First, there was the question of computers, which was still unresolved and in the settlement of which account would have to be taken not only of magnetic recorders but of other equipment of a strategic nature. In other words, Item 1572 could only be defined after Item 1565 had been defined. The second point involved by the United Kingdom proposal concerned the strategic uses of these recorders. The Delegate stated that electronic computers did not constitute the only strategic application for these recorders. The Delegate had in mind, for example, recorders designed for pictures (video-tape). He stated that at present there was nothing to prove that the Bloc possessed completely up-to-date recorders. It would appear on the contrary that their production in this field was clearly behindhand. The Delegate considered, lastly, that the fact that a product was not under embargo did not automatically imply the release of the accessories or ancillary equipment which might be used in conjunction therewith. In conclusion, the Delegate stated that he would be glad to hear the views of other Delegations on this matter.

3. As the other Delegations considered that the problem was essentially a technical one, the COMMITTEE agreed to refer the study of the United Kingdom proposal to a Working Group whose task would be to look for an acceptable compromise between the United Kingdom proposal for amendment and the United States preference for the status quo.

4. The WORKING GROUP found that, failing prior agreement in the Committee on the definition of Item 1565, they could not usefully examine the United Kingdom proposal. They agreed to await the result of the second phase of the debate on Item 1565 before seeking to recommend a new definition for Item 1572.

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

- 2 -

COCOM Document 3715.72/2B

5. On the 8th December, after a lengthy exchange of views, the COMMITTEE noted that they were unable to reach agreement on Item 1565. They therefore agreed to retain the present definition provisionally, until the Committee should take up the matter again at a later date.

CONCLUSION : The COMMITTEE agreed to retain the present definition of Item 1572. It was understood that this was a provisional solution and that the Committee would resume the study of the United Kingdom proposal at the same time as the new review of Item 1565.

S E C R E T